

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Amendments To The Drawings

Replacement sheets for Figs. 6, 7 and 9 accompany this Response. The replacement sheets incorporate the following changes to the figures as originally filed.

Fig. 6

part number 615 changed to 614

part number 625 changed to 624

Fig. 7

part number 716-6 changed to 716-5

part number 716 changed to 718

Fig. 9

added part number 612

part number 715 changed to 718

Remarks

Claim 1-2, 5-8, 11-14 and 17-18 are pending. Claims 3-4, 9-10 and 15-16 are canceled in this Response.

Objections To The Specification

The drawings and the specification have been amended to correct the informalities noted by the Office at page 2 of the pending Action.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1 and 5-6 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Biegelsen (6335084). The other claims were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Biegelsen in view of Ueda (5801722) (Claims 7, 11-13 and 17-18) and further in view of Meunier (6582138) (Claims 2, 8 and 14).

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of original Claim 4 and to recite sensing a media marking on a face of a sheet of print media if the media marking is imprinted on the face of the sheet and sensing a media marking on an edge of a sheet of print media if the media marking is imprinted on the edge of the sheet. Similar amendments have been made to Claims 7 and 13.

In Biegelsen, the markings are imprinted on and sensed from only the edge of the sheets. Biegelsen, therefore, does not teach all of the limitations of Claim 1 as amended.

Biegelsen teaches media markings on the edge of the sheets. The Office has interpreted Ueda as teaching media markings on the face of the sheets. Applicant acknowledges in the Background section of the Application that it was known in the art to place markings on the face of the sheet or on the edge of the sheet. The problem with these prior art markings, also noted in the Background, is that a printer designed to detect a marking on the face of the sheet cannot detect a marking on the edge of the sheet, and a printer designed to detect a marking on the edge of the sheet cannot detect a marking on the face of the sheet. Thus, depending on whether media parameter information is marked on the edge or face of the print media, the printer may not be able to detect any media parameters from marked print media. Accordingly, certain print media are relegated to being properly imaged by a subset of all of the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

possible imaging devices that may have otherwise been able to form a proper image on the media. Specification, page 3, lines 1-14.

Neither Biegelsen nor Ueda recognize this as a problem in the art. Indeed, neither Biegelsen nor Ueda even contemplate anything other than marking exclusively on the edge (Biegelsen) or on the face (Ueda). Hence, there is no suggestion or motivation in either reference that a printer should be capable of detecting a marking on the edge and on the face. The Office states that such a printer would be obvious "to provide redundant means to identify each sheet as being a particular type of image recording media", citing to Biegelsen column 4, lines 63-65. First, Biegelsen doesn't say anything about redundancy. The cited passage says only that the "indicia" identifies each sheet as a first type of media. Hence, the Office's proffered motivation to combine Biegelsen and Ueda is not supported in the art.

Second, redundancy does not motivate the claimed invention. As noted above, the problem with the prior art marking systems is not the absence of redundancy, rather it is that printers were designed to read only one type of marking. There is nothing whatsoever in either Biegelsen or Ueda that even remotely suggests a printer that could (or should) have the capability to detect both types of markings. That is to say, there is no motivation to combine Biegelsen and Ueda for sensing a media marking on a face of a sheet of print media if the media marking is imprinted on the face of the sheet and sensing a media marking on an edge of a sheet of print media if the media marking is imprinted on the edge of the sheet. If the Office disagrees, it is respectfully requested to specifically point out those passages in Biegelsen or Ueda that might reasonable be interpreted as suggesting or motivating a printer that can read media markings on the face of a sheet and on the edge of a sheet. Absent such a showing, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and the rejections should be withdrawn.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Haines

By


Steven R. Ormiston
Reg. No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204